

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION**

ISREAL HUDGINS, #1649033,

Plaintiff,

v.

WARDEN JEFFREY CATOE, *et al.*,

Defendants.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Case No. 6:19-CV-403-JDK-JDL


**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

This action was referred to United States Magistrate Judge John D. Love pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636. Docket No. 1. On March 13, 2020, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 20, the “Report”), recommending that Plaintiff’s claims regarding his disciplinary cases be dismissed with prejudice to the claims being asserted again until the *Heck* conditions, *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477, 486–87 (1994), are met and Plaintiff’s civil rights complaints be dismissed with prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1). Plaintiff filed written objections. Docket No. 22.

The Court reviews objected-to portions of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation de novo. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 72 and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (“A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings and recommendations to which objection is made.”). The Court conducting a de novo review examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Having reviewed Plaintiff's objections de novo, the Court concludes that the objections are without merit and that the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge are correct. Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's objections are **OVERRULED** and that the Magistrate Judge's Report (Docket No. 20) is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of this Court. Further, it is **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's complaints regarding his disciplinary cases are **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** to his claims being asserted again until the *Heck* conditions are met. It is finally **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's suit is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1).

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **13th** day of **April, 2020**.

  
JEREMY D. KERNODLE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE